



**Committee on Community Resources
and the Northampton City Council**

Committee Members:

Chair: Councilor James B. Nash

Vice-Chair: Councilor Alex Jarrett

Councilor John Thorpe

Councilor Karen Foster

Meeting Agenda

Date: September 20, 2021

Time: 5 p.m.

Virtual Meeting

The September 20, 2021 Community Resources Committee meeting will be held by remote participation. The public can follow the committee's deliberations by joining the virtual meeting by phone or computer. The meeting will be recorded for later broadcast on Northampton Open Media (channel 15) and uploaded to the Northampton Government Video Archive on YouTube.

Live public comment will be available using telephone call-in or video conferencing technology beginning at 5 p.m.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR CALLING IN OR JOINING THE MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

Join Virtual Meeting: <https://bit.ly/3nBD90c>

For telephone call-in, call:

+929 436-2866 US

MEETING ID: 870 0602 9252

PARTICIPANT #: #

PASSCODE: 859315

"Jurisdiction. Matters affecting the community including economic development, local business, tourism, the environment, the arts, planning, zoning, sustainability, land use, housing and affordability, among others"

1. Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call

2. Announcement re: Audio/Video Recording

Announcement that meeting is being conducted via remote participation and audio/video recorded.

3. Public Comment

4. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

A. Minutes of January 27, 2021 and April 26, 2021

Documents:

[04-26-2021_Community Resources Minutes.pdf](#)

[01-27-2021_Community Resources Minutes.pdf](#)

5. Updates and Announcements from Committee Members

6. Items Referred to Committee

A. 21.313 An Ordinance to Amend the Zoning Map, §350-3.4, at Chapel Street - referred by City Council 8/19/2021

Documents:

[21.313 An Ordinance To Amend The Zoning Map, Section 350-3.4, At Chapel Street.pdf](#)

7. New Business

8. Adjourn

Contact: Jim Nash@

jimnashcitycouncil@gmail.com

Phone: 413-582-0637



Committee on Community Resources and the Northampton City Council

Committee Members:

Chair: Councilor James Nash

Vice-Chair: Councilor Alex Jarrett

Councilor Karen Foster

Councilor John Thorpe

Meeting Minutes

Date: April 26, 2021

Time: 5 p.m.

Virtual Meeting Via Zoom

1. **Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call.** At 5:01 p.m. Councilor Nash called the meeting to order. Present were Councilors James Nash, Chair; Alex Jarrett, Vice-Chair; Karen Foster (5:04 p.m.) and John Thorpe. Also present were Office of Planning and Sustainability (OPS) Assistant Director Carolyn Misch and Administrative Assistant Laura Krutzler.
2. **Announcement of Audio/Video Recording**
Councilor Nash announced that the meeting was being audio and video recorded.
3. **Public Comment**
Councilor Nash opened the floor to general public comment. He advised members of the public that they would be able to interact with councilors during discussion of the individual agenda items, so they should hold their comments if they are related to specific items. There being no general public comment, Councilor Nash proceeded to the next agenda item.
4. **Updates and Announcements from Committee Members**
Regarding municipal broadband, Safe Tech Northampton is holding a forum at 6 pm. today on municipal internet, Councilor Nash announced. The Zoom link can be found on Facebook.

Councilor Foster joined at 5:04 p.m.
5. **Approval of Minutes of January 27, 2021**
Councilor Jarrett moved to approve the minutes of January 27, 2021. Councilor Thorpe seconded.

Approval was tabled until the next meeting
6. **Items Referred to Committee**
 - A. **21.217 An Ordinance to Move Zero Lot Line from Section 10.14 to Section 6.13 - referred by City Council 4/1/2021**

B. 21.218 An Ordinance to Amend Zero Lot Line Section of Code - referred by City Council 4/1/2021

Councilor Nash introduced Office of Planning and Sustainability (OPS) Assistant Director Carolyn Misch. He framed the discussion by saying it is meant to be an opportunity for the public to engage with councilors on the committee around these particular zoning proposals.

Councilor Jarrett asked if they would be voting on a recommendation and Councilor Nash said yes.

Ms. Misch gave a brief Powerpoint presentation [see attachment to master version of minutes].

Zero Lot line Modifications

Ms. Misch gave a brief history of the zero lot line (ZLL) ordinance, which has been on the books for over 20 years in various forms. Initially it was adopted to allow for a variety of layouts. In residential cluster developments - developments of at least four acres where lots are clustered with some land permanently protected as open space – it was one option an applicant could use to locate buildings in a cluster.

A few years later, it was adopted for use in Urban Residential B (URB) and Urban Residential C (URC) districts, generally the neighborhoods that surround downtown Northampton and Florence center. When adopted there, it was initially frequently used to enable a reduction in the frontage requirement for lots.

ZLL means one lot line has a zero side setback, she clarified.

Ms. Misch showed examples of its use in years past and currently. The frontage requirement for standard lots used to be larger, so ZLL was a way to reduce frontage as well as to reduce the side setback. Frontage was initially 75 feet and but was later dropped to 50 feet. After frontage requirements in URB and C were reduced, the use of ZLL to reduce frontage was no longer necessary. It was still a good tool to allow more flexibility in locating structures on a property.

She showed an example of the use of this provision when it allowed for a reduction in frontage. The house isn't right at the lot line but maybe three or four feet away. She showed two other examples on Crosby Street. There, it allowed a slightly bigger house footprint.

She showed an example of ZLL use on Emerson Way allowing a lot line to run down the middle of a two-family structure. This scenario was the initial impetus for creating ZLL. It arose through conversations with Habitat for Humanity about their interest in allowing homeowners to each own their own property even though sharing a party wall. It afforded each unit owner ownership of the land beneath their unit.

After changes in 2012 and 2013 in frontage, the use of ZLL became more about creating opportunities for flexibility in side setbacks. The ordinance before them is another step in tweaking ZLL. It was specifically put forward because of concerns heard about the designs of ZLL developments, in particular, the concern that, without greater setbacks, house placements create the sense of an alley between houses. Also, there was a concern that ZLL wasn't clearly enough defined as being only applicable to single-family homes and therefore could be interpreted as being able to be applied to duplexes.

This language clarifies that. It increases the setbacks and sets out clearer standards through the use of graphics to illustrate what ZLL means. Over the years she's been with the planning office, she has always had to explain ZLL to builders. She hopes the graphics will eliminate the need for a verbal explanation.

The other piece is to change the location of the ZLL section to be within the dimensional standards of zoning (Section 6). Since the concept originated in the context of special permits for cluster developments, the standard has lived there for 20 years although it is referred to in the by-right standards. As they did for flag lot standards, etc., they have moved it into Section 6.

Ms. Misch showed examples of three different scenarios in which ZLL would be allowed:

- 1) if a property owner is creating open space, he/she can put a structure right on the property line adjacent to the open space with no setback. This wouldn't be applicable for lots abutting existing city-owned open space, she clarified.
- 2) in a duplex scenario, the property line can be located right down the middle of a structure.
- 3) if a property owner had a series of lots and wanted to create three lots with zero lot lines, they could do so with each structure being on the opposite side lot line but the last parcel in the series would have to serve as a 'bookend' and create the standard separation with an adjacent parcel not under the same ownership.

She doesn't know if two and a half times (2.5x) the regular setback is the right standard, Ms. Misch said. Planners proposed the higher standard with the goal of trying to create a bigger buffer between the series of ZLL lots and other lots in the neighborhood, she explained.

Effect of Change

Beyond reorganizing the zoning and creating graphics to help explain the text, the proposed change eliminates the option of reduced setbacks, instead requiring that the setback be either zero or meet the standard requirement, she continued. The downside is that it reduces flexibility. If there is nothing between zero and 15 feet, a property owner is really confined to a small house footprint.

There are many examples of setbacks in URB and URC that are 10 feet. In URC, side setbacks are ten feet, so residents can have a 30 foot-wide house.

One thing to consider would be eliminating the two times minimum setback for the last structure in a series since this is twice the width of many of the standard setbacks. An alternative would be to require 15 feet of total separation between the last structure and the structure on an adjacent lot under different ownership to avoid the 'alley' effect, she suggested.

Another alternative would be to look at URA, B and C districts in total and think about reducing all setbacks in those districts to match what many setbacks are already. In many cases, existing setbacks are 12 feet.

She showed an example of the use of ZLL where the houses are about five feet from the property line on both sides.

Councilor Nash asked Ms. Misch to explain the 'alley' effect.

It's the idea of having houses really close together and a small pathway between two structures, Ms. Misch explained. It is meant to describe the proximity of two structures to each other.

Councilor Thorpe moved to make a positive recommendation on the ordinances. Councilor Foster seconded.

Councilor Jarrett noted that ZLL developments in URB and URC are by right. He asked if she could explain why they don't require site plan review. Looking at a townhome style ZLL development in URA, it creates a two-family in appearance but doesn't have the fossil fuel-free requirement or trigger the significant tree ordinance. Why does the city not require site plan review for ZLL? He asked.

On Emerson Way, six lots were created as duplex lots way back in 2003, Ms. Misch related. Over time, the developer amended the cluster/open space project to propose two structures on two separate lots instead of one lot with two structures.

Structures built using the ZLL provision have always been viewed as single-family homes. Although from the street it looks like a duplex, it is defined as a single-family because it consists of one unit on a parcel. ZLL is only applicable in the case of a single-family residence and single-family homes have always been by right.

ZLL is a type of zoning bonus, Councilor Jarrett noted. Since zoning requires more trees for ZLL lots, he asked if they could also require fossil fuel-free heating systems.

It is a single structure on a single lot so essentially it is considered a single-family house lot, Ms. Misch clarified. They are still treating them as single-family homes and not duplexes.

The provision for requiring more trees has been in zoning for 15 years. As he mentioned, ZLL was like a density bonus because it allowed lots with less frontage and setbacks. That being the case, they wanted to incorporate some elements that would enable a new structure to fit into an existing neighborhood, such as matching the number and types of plantings on the lots of existing homes.

Site plan is the creation of a local community so they can add any things they want. The idea is just to include in zoning features planners want to see instead of sending the project for site plan approval.

Councilor Jarrett expressed his understanding that they cannot require fossil fuel free heating systems for ZLL because it is still a single-family home on a single lot.

Councilor Foster expressed her understanding that one of the uses for ZLL would be to free up space on the lot for a larger home. Rather than a 20-foot wide house, it could allow for a larger house.

A wider house may not necessarily allow for a larger footprint but just an easier footprint in which to work, Ms. Misch countered.

One of the concerns they're hearing is the cost of housing in Northampton and incentives for development of larger housing, Councilor Foster related. What she's trying to understand is, if they move toward ZLL, are they incentivizing or making easier the development of larger houses.

"We have ZLL now," Ms. Misch pointed out. What she's heard from builders is that in some situations it is actually harder to build in a skinnier footprint because it requires building something custom. That may add to the cost as opposed to pulling a design off the shelf.

She can't say these changes will result in smaller houses that will be more affordable, Ms. Misch acknowledged. The goal of the changes is to make ZLL easier to understand and to address the design concern about the close proximity of some houses to each other. It's not the intent of the ordinance to try to dictate the size of a house someone might build.

Councilor Thorpe asked what some of the drawbacks are.

The primary drawback is the loss of the flexibility with which ZLL has been used, Ms. Misch said. It has been used primarily to reduce setbacks but not all the way to zero. The biggest downside is the reduction in flexibility, particularly with a 55-foot wide parcel.

With regard to the observation that URB and URC already have different setbacks, Councilor Jarrett asked what she would think about the idea of ZLL being either zero feet or five feet less than the minimum setback; i.e. - 10 feet in URB and five feet in URC. The idea is to key it to the existing zoning requirement and allow some reduction, but not to the point that would go beyond what is typical for those neighborhoods.

Ms. Misch said she thought that is a great approach and would provide/keep some flexibility but not let houses get so close to another structure that it looks out of place for the district.

Councilor Nash asked if the amended ordinance has any impact on a two-family.

Only in that it clarifies that ZLL is only applicable to one principal structure on a property, not to two detached structures, Ms. Misch said.

Councilor Nash opened the floor to comments from the public. He recognized Jackie Ballance.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jackie Ballance asked a quick math question. Could a lot with 50 feet of frontage, a house on the absolute zero lot line on one side and a 15-foot setback on the other have a 35-foot façade, five feet wider than the current limit? She asked.

Ms. Misch said her math is correct, but only in the scenario where there are touching structures.

Bill Ryan thanked Ms. Misch for advancing this proposal. It stimulates a lot of thought. He said he thought the point Ms. Ballance is making is that if someone has two structures side by side, it could potentially be 70 feet wide. He thinks her concern is that this proposal would allow for very wide houses. Or, where a property owner has three houses side by side, they could have three 35-foot wide houses with only 15 feet between them. It goes back to Councilor Foster's question of whether this allows larger houses to be built. It's a valid concern because, as they've seen in developments in Bay State, it will lead to wider houses than otherwise allowed.

Ms. Misch said she doesn't think the houses in Bay State are wider than normal.

With ZLL you wind up with much wider houses with less space between them so it changes the rhythm of the streetscape, Mr. Ryan asserted. It allows for wider houses than was originally envisioned. Most of the houses in his area of Bay State are more of the 25-foot scale. "It just sets up a different feeling in the neighborhood when these big square houses come in," he commented.

Ms. Misch said she understands the concern but there's nothing in this proposal that adds to the width allowed. There is no standard width in any of these neighborhoods. Many of the 50-foot wide lots built on have much less of a setback, she pointed out.

He thinks there are ways of figuring out how to deal with this because ZLL has some advantages, Mr. Ryan said. Councilor Jarrett's suggestion that it move to site plan approval makes a lot of sense to him.

Referring to a scenario described in an email from Bill Ryan (see Scenario #2 in attachment to minutes), Councilor Jarrett noted that a developer could *not* have three 35-foot wide houses with three 50-foot lots; only two of them could be 35 feet because the last one would have to have two times the standard setback. A property owner has to have a series of lots in order to have a wider house. He does have some concern about allowing what appears to be a two-family without site plan review, he volunteered. He said he is not sure how to address it.

The problem as she sees it is a matter of proportion, Ms. Ballance remarked. When you have a smaller lot, it begs for a smaller house. A small lot wants something in proportion, in harmony. She said she has other comments for 21.217.

Councilor Nash invited her to proceed.

The administrative assistant screen-shared a series of pictures submitted by Ms. Ballance as Ms. Ballance offered explanatory comments. Ms. Ballance said she would like the city solicitor to look at 350-10.14 Zero Lot Line Developments to see if they require special permits. According to where it sits in the code, she expressed the opinion that it does. She doesn't want to move it from that location, she stressed.

It started out as an option within cluster development special permits but is now shown as 'by right' in the Table of Use under URB and URC, Ms. Misch reiterated. The table refers the user to Section 10.14 for other layout and planting requirements. At the time when ZLL was added to URB and URC, instead of creating a special section, planners just referred to Section 10.14. It doesn't mean it needs a special permit, it just means that is where those provisions live.

She talked to Attorney Seewald about Jackie's concern and he said he thought it makes sense for ZLL to go in Section 6 and that it is clear in the Tables of Use that ZLL is allowed by right.

"It's under special permits. Leave it there," Ms. Ballance requested.

Councilor Jarrett expressed his understanding that the zoning amendment would not apply to projects already in progress such as 61 Warner Street.

If an ordinance is adopted, the ordinance is viewed as being in effect from the date of the public hearing notice, Ms. Misch clarified. If someone pulled a building permit before the public hearing notice was

published, the new zoning would not apply. If John Handzel already has a building permit, this ordinance would not affect it.

The issue of whether it is a development or a single-family house creates a difficult conundrum, Mr. Ryan suggested. For people concerned about this, it is a development because it is three big houses being built. But the only person to talk to about it is the building department. There is no place in the system where there is consideration of this as a three-family development. All the protections given to single-family homes are basically extended to this three-family home development.

They are now looking at situation where a developer is using ZLL in a different way. It is a whole different use of ZLL and needs to be reviewed in that context. To him, ZLL is an exception to the standard zoning. Normally, to get an exception someone would need to get a special permit. In this case, a developer would get a bonus because ZLL is allowed by right. "It's complicated," he observed.

He expressed hope that they can continue to have a conversation about how to solve this problem.

Single-family house lots are single-family house lots Ms. Misch responded. There have been times when people have created a whole series of lots at once and they were all single-family house lots. It doesn't really matter if someone creating four lots feels like a development if the developer is meeting the requirements and not creating a subdivision – it goes through the Approval Not Required (ANR) process.

This is the first time the ZLL has been used this extensively for this type of series of lots side by side, Mr. Ryan asserted.

No, Ms. Misch said. Each of John Handzel's projects are only two ZLL houses next to each other. That's happened on other occasions.

Reyes Lazaro said it is very hard to follow regulations where language seems to have lost its meaning. Somebody can build 20 houses and as long as they follow regulations for single-family homes, it is not considered a 'development.' To her, something is wrong with this picture. She lives across from one of these projects on Warner Street. This is part of a larger movement in the U.S. economy where these kinds of houses are being built and people who are victims of the economy in their own city cannot afford them. In this context, they are allowing language to lose its meaning to enable things like this and they are being told these are single-family houses. Something is wrong with this kind of regulation that enables things that shouldn't be enabled.

Ms. Misch said she uses the term 'development' loosely to mean anything that's being built. It sounds like people in this neighborhood understand 'development' to mean something requiring a special permit or site plan review. These are single-family homes on single lots and even those she refers to as 'developments.' She wasn't trying to state that the word development doesn't mean development.

Reyes thanked Ms. Misch. She said she supported Ms. Ballance's comment that this belongs in the special permit section of the ordinance.

ZLL as stated does allow for wider, possibly large single-family houses, Councilor Jarrett observed. Without ZLL, larger houses could only be built with larger lot sizes which would either result in fewer houses being

built or smaller houses. Or, a development would have to be structured as a condo association but would then have to go through a site plan review or special permit process. That's the range of possibilities.

He wants them to think about where that threshold is and what it will push development toward, whether it be toward fewer larger units, more smaller units or condo associations with more units but more review.

Councilor Nash asked Ms. Misch if that matches the way she sees things.

She is not sure if ZLL either in its current form or as proposed is necessarily going to dictate building big vs. small, Ms. Misch reflected. It all depends on the size of the lot. On a 50-foot lot, the flexibility of having a reduced setback definitely allows something wider than 20 feet. Many houses are between 22 and 28 feet wide.

For the development at the corner of Warner and Hinckley Street that everyone really doesn't like, if Mr. Handzel couldn't get three lots in there, he could potentially do two lots with two structures on one lot with a condo association or three structures on a single lot under a condo situation. What they have seen is that market drivers are directed more toward individual homes on their own lots.

Mr. Ryan said he thinks the proposal that has been put forth has some potential. Also, Councilor Jarrett's idea of zero or 10 makes a lot of sense to him. 15 feet is too narrow, but 20 starts to get them there.

Councilor Jarrett said he is uncertain how to proceed. He would like to do more thinking. He thinks it is fair to ask Councilor Thorpe to change his motion from a positive to a neutral recommendation with the idea that more discussion is to come.

Councilor Thorpe/Councilor Foster moved to accept this as a friendly amendment. The motion to forward the ordinances with a neutral recommendation passed unanimously with 4 Yes, 0 No by roll call vote.

Councilor Jarrett requested a five-minute recess. The committee recessed at 6:41 p.m. The committee reconvened at 6:46 p.m.

7. Update on Regulation of Wireless Communications Facilities

Discussion with Office of Planning and Sustainability (OPS) Assistant Director Carolyn Misch

She asked for this to be on the agenda because she has been hearing concerns from the community about the installation of small cell wireless antennas, Councilor Foster explained. She understands that the city cannot regulate them based on health or environmental factors. Other councilors were reaching out to her saying, 'hey, do you want to work on this.' In order to talk to colleagues openly, she asked for it to be put on tonight's agenda.

A couple of thoughts seem to be worth reconsidering. She asked Ms. Misch how many applications for small cell facilities have currently been approved in Northampton. Is there more they can do to regulate by ordinance? Could they look at the potential for setbacks from residences based on aesthetics, fall zones, etc.? Is there a potential to incorporate a public hearing when small cells are proposed or could the process include monitoring for radio frequency emissions?

Ms. Misch said they haven't had any applications since the council adopted the update a year ago. 'Small cells' are antennas used to fill in gaps between cell towers, typically located within the right-of-way rather than mounted on monopoles. Prior to the council vote, there were perhaps seven. These are not 5G; they are essentially gap fillers between towers.

Because they are filling in gaps in service, they necessarily are in areas with greater populations. She is not sure what a setback from a residence would be intended to do. They have built into the existing regulations standards for aesthetics, including how they want them to be camouflaged or masked to the extent possible, so that's already built-in. She doesn't believe they have the ability to say hard and fast it has to be x feet from a residence.

In terms of a public hearing, the reason they went through the review a year ago is because the equipment will be automatically approved by the FCC if the city doesn't approve it. It doesn't make sense to have a public hearing which might imply that the public has a role in determining whether it can be approved. The idea was to set up very specific criteria that have to be met and to provide for an administrative review.

The application goes to the DPW since the equipment will primarily be within the right-of-way. The draft regulations set up an application process and call for an annual fee to allow regular review. The renewal application has a series of questions and check boxes such as 'are you still meeting the maximum approved FCC radio frequency?' New applications are required to show the need and identify the gap being filled, type of equipment and where located, shrouding mechanism, etc., i.e. - all the information needed for physical equipment going within the right-of-way.

Councilor Foster asked who is responsible for testing, and Ms. Misch confirmed it is the carrier. The city gets a copy of the results.

Councilor Foster said she understood the problem with holding a public hearing but asked if it is possible to give notice of small cell applications to people living nearby. Has Ms. Misch seen this incorporated in other communities? She asked.

Notice goes out for public hearings but not for administrative reviews, Ms. Misch replied. She doesn't think it makes sense to set up an arbitrary distance for who gets notified. Northampton has been trying city-wide to adopt a permitting system that's easily accessible. The planning office has a link to permits issued by the boards it staffs and the building department has a link to building permits. COVID highlighted the fact that they are really far behind in publicly-accessible documents from each department. Planners have advocated for the public being able to go on the website and see any permits that have been applied for.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Councilor Nash recognized Kim Weeber.

Kim Weeber said she is learning some new information today, namely that applicants are required to let the city know which frequencies they are transmitting as part of the permitting process. She asked for copies of the local ordinance.

She understands the bind the city is in because of FCC regulations, which are rather onerous, she continued. She thinks the city has been led to believe it doesn't have a lot of influence when it actually has more than it might think. One thing the city can do is protect property values, she stressed. She related an

experience she had while measuring the frequencies and power output of cell antennas in the Bay State neighborhood. A woman came out of her house to say she was selling. It was a young person who has developed an illness similar to microwave illness. She asked if the woman would be willing to come speak to the city council, and she said, no, she can't be public about it because she is concerned about her property value and her ability to sell the house. Right here in Northampton there is a property value issue due to a cell antenna close to a number of homes, Ms. Weeber pointed out.

"We have the ability to protect our property values and the way we can do that is with setbacks," she insisted. There is nothing in the FCC regulation that says this cannot be done. Shelburne has 1,500 foot setbacks and Burlington has 200 feet. Various communities around the country have various setbacks.

She sent links to multiple real estate studies that show there is not uncommonly a 20% loss of value to homes right next to these cell antennas. "We can take that into account," she asserted.

The city is allowing telecom companies to make decisions about things they could have more input into, she suggested. When Verizon says it has a gap in service and needs to put a small cell antenna for JFK close to a house, they can look at it and say it's going to affect the property value of that home. There's no reason Verizon couldn't put the antenna at Child's Park where it's not right in front of somebody's house. Similarly, the antenna on Spring Grove for JFK could have been put at Look Park, she suggested.

She referred to the survey recently put out by the Mayor's office for municipal broadband. Municipal broadband is faster, more secure and way more energy efficient. Can they hard wire these schools so they don't need small cell antennas? She questioned.

Ms. Misch said she received the information about property values but thinks it is a hard thing to latch onto definitively. Shelburne has several cell towers within 1,500 feet of homes, she noted. It would be interesting to see if communities that have these regulations on the books are actually enforcing them.

As far as city ordinances, it may make sense to evaluate the authority the city has to regulate based on property values, she agreed. In terms of notice, since it is not a public hearing process she thinks they wouldn't be notifying people, but they should be bolstering public access to all permits granted, she agreed.

As far as locating the antennas, when gap analyses are submitted, she doesn't know if providers can just leave one spot and go to another and get the same coverage.

Councilor Jarrett said he spoke with the city solicitor, and his opinion is that they can try to regulate the distance from homes and schools for aesthetic and visual impacts, fall zones, property values, etc. but that this could be overruled by coverage needs. His thought is that it would be better to attempt to regulate and place the burden on the company to demonstrate the necessity for an antenna in a proposed location. It's not going to hurt them to try, but they might be overruled, Councilor Jarrett concluded.

AnneLouise Smallen said that, for her, it is really a question of health. There are certainly proofs that these can be detrimental to people's health, especially children. She wanted to voice that if ever more permits are required, they should have serious review by the Board of Health (BOH) before proceeding.

Unfortunately, even though there has been a lot of discussion about health, they can't review these based on health impacts. That's very clear in the regulation, Ms. Misch stated. Ms. Misch signed off.

The guidance they've received from Attorney Seewald is that they can't regulate based on health and environmental impacts, Councilor Foster confirmed. If they're going to regulate them, they need to be looking at other factors.

"Then let's review for value of our property," Ms. Smallen said.

The original FCC regulation is very clear that *environment* is not to be taken into account but it says nothing about health, Ms. Weeber clarified. Health came in based on lawsuits. That is going through the courts right now and they are going to see some changes, she projected.

One of the things she has been doing is trying to look through regulations on the books in different cities to see which ones make the most sense for Northampton, Ms. Weeber shared. She would like to know where to present those and to whom.

Legislation can either come from the mayor or a councilor, Councilor Nash advised. She has the ear of four councilors now, and his suggestion is that she keep talking to them. If she has more information in the future, he is happy to consider putting this on a future agenda.

Ms. Weeber said she hoped they had a chance to look at the letters Ms. Smallen sent. The real estate studies are really clear. Nationwide and even international studies show that cell antennas cause the loss of property values. Even HUD says that appraisers need to consider whether there's a cell antenna near a property. There's plenty of precedent for using property values to help protect themselves.

Councilor Jarrett said he is very interested in continuing to work on this. The challenge for him is distilling the information into a proposed change to the ordinance. He welcomes continuing to talk about this.

After Burlington passed its ordinance, Verizon pulled out of trying to put cell towers there, Ms. Weeber advised. There are a number of things they can do to protect themselves and community broadband is a good way to go.

8. **Follow-up Discussions on Plastic Reduction and the Waste Stream and Housing Security**

Councilor Nash proposed tabling discussion of these items until the next meeting.

9. **New Business**

None.

10. **Adjourn.** Councilor Jarrett moved to adjourn the meeting; Councilor Foster seconded. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 4 Yes, 0 No. The meeting was adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

Prepared By:

Laura Krutzler, Administrative Assistant
(413) 587-1210



Joint Meeting of Community Resources/City Services Committees and the Northampton City Council

Committee Members:

Chair: Councilor James Nash

Vice-Chair: Councilor Alex Jarrett

Councilor Karen Foster

Councilor John Thorpe

Meeting Minutes

Date: January 27, 2021

Time: 5 p.m.

Virtual Meeting Via Zoom

1. **Meeting Called to Order and Roll Call.** At 5:01 p.m. Councilor Nash called the meeting to order. Present were Councilors James Nash, Chair; Alex Jarrett, Vice-Chair; Karen Foster and John Thorpe.
2. **City Services Committee Members Present:** Councilor Marianne LaBarge, Chair, Councilor Karen Foster, Vice-Chair; Councilor Michael Quinlan and Councilor Rachel Maiore (5:25 p.m.). Also present were Pamela Schwarz of the Western Massachusetts Network to End Homelessness, Pastor Stephanie Smith of Cathedral in the Night, Jay Sacchetti, Vice President of Shelter & Housing, Vocational & Addiction Services, ServiceNet, Danna Boughton, Coordinator of Community Resources and Advocacy at Community Action Pioneer Valley (CAPV), Janna Tetreault, CAPV Assistant Director of Community Services and Jay Levy, Western and Central MA Regional Manager, Elliott CHS Homeless Services.
3. **Public Comment**
Councilor Nash opened the floor to general public comment.
4. **Approval of October 26, 2020 Minutes**
Councilor Thorpe moved to approve the minutes of October 26, 2020. Councilor Foster seconded. The motion passed 3:0 by roll call vote with Councilor Jarrett recused.
5. **Program Topic: Housing Security**
They have been hearing a lot of concerns about folks in the downtown community and their plight during the pandemic, Councilor Nash related. They are also hearing concerns from people facing eviction and questions about services available to them. The line-up of speakers is intended to address those questions and help them frame how to proceed moving forward. He asked for a motion to recognize Pastor Steph Smith.

Councilor Foster so moved. Councilor Thorpe seconded. The motion passed unanimously 4:0 by roll call vote,

Councilor Quinlan moved to recognize Pastor Steph Smith on behalf of the City Services Committee. Councilor Foster seconded. The motion passed 3:0 by roll call vote with Councilor Maiore absent.

Councilor Nash recognized former City Councilor Pamela Schwarz from the Western MA Network to End Homelessness. He said he is hoping she can help frame what's going on for the houseless population, what services are out there and what councilors can do to help.

Ms. Schwartz described what the homeless network does and the umbrella that it offers. The network is a funnel from 'on the ground' [conditions] to state, region and even national advocacy. The network's mission is to prevent and end homelessness with a housing first approach that centers racial equity.

It's a very streamlined operation. She is the single staff person, she explained. She helps facilitate the convening of somewhere between 400 and 500 organizations across the region, including state agencies, legislators and mayors. (She noted Mayor Narkewicz is part of their leadership council.) Every single person they are going to hear from tonight is part of their network. They are all very connected together.

'Housing first' means the very best and most effective response to homelessness is housing with accompanying support systems, Ms. Schwartz continued. The first thing they do is house people. It is distinct from a related concept that became disavowed on a data basis which is 'housing ready.' What sprung the shelter industry into something much larger than anyone ever envisioned was the concept that everything needs to be worked out before someone gets into housing; in other words, if someone needs substance abuse treatment, needs a job, needs a GED, addiction services, etc., they need to get it all lined up before they get into housing. That has been disproven. There is data-driven evidence that it is not as effective for stable housing by a long shot as housing first.

That's what drives all their work.

The network has an umbrella, a leadership council made up of state legislators, mayors and leaders across every sector (community colleges, hospitals, housing and shelter providers, etc.). Next they work on a committee level by population. They convene all of the entities working across these sectors by subpopulation each month. One of the things that sprung up through the pandemic is the Western MA COVID19 task force for housing first. Each community from Springfield to Holyoke and Pittsfield to North Adams reports on what's happening on the ground in their community around shelter capacity, current needs, testing, vaccinations, etc.

The network also works on a policy level. They worked very hard to create more tenant protection during the pandemic, she reported. They were really after a tenant stability act on a state level; instead they got more tenant protections. One of the things they won in the FY2021 budget passed December 31st is additional tenant protections against eviction so that, if a rental assistance application is pending, the eviction process can be delayed. They also achieved a mandate that trial courts report to the legislature what's happening with evictions during the pandemic.

In the first report, they just learned there were 449 executions for possession statewide in the month of December alone. Executions for possession are the very last step in the eviction process meaning the sheriff is coming to put your stuff on the street.

She strongly urged all to join their network if they want to be connected to what's going on with evictions on a state level. The report will tell them that, in the month of December, .9% of tenants had legal representation as compared to 71% of landlords. She knows this council has weighed in on the right to counsel on a statewide level. They can see how vital this is to pass on a statewide level when they are looking at .9% having representation.

Since the eviction moratorium was lifted on October 17th there have been over 1,200 eviction filings in Western Massachusetts alone, she reported. In Hampshire County there have been 79 eviction filings, in Franklin County, 59, in Berkshire County, 148 and in Hampden County, 873, with the City of Springfield holding 542 of them. This is deeply concerning. That's just the nonpayment of rent cases.

She referred to the Rental Assistance for Families in Transition (RAFT) program, a state program providing rental assistance. Way Finders, the regional housing authority, is right now getting over 400 applications for rental assistance each week. The wait for those applications to be processed is roughly six to eight weeks. Their crisis response is, in effect, not able to be a crisis response now due to the demand. On the brighter side, the state Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) has simplified some of the eligibility rules and added staff. Way Finders has hired 60 people; they are working very hard to speed up the process, but it isn't fast enough and everybody agrees it is substantially overloaded.

Community Legal Aid is also working to assist tenants. She said she would make sure to provide the phone number to call.

Members have worked very hard as a Western MA voice in the network to bring to bear their sense of urgency around tenant protections and that is continuing in this legislative session. They have fantastic legislators, Senator Jo Comerford and Representative Lindsay Sabadosa. They are front and center on this; they are in their court working very hard. New legislation will be filed to increase housing stability. She is asking them now to join them in that as councilors and individuals.

Ms. Schwartz said she was going to wind up the big picture and move to the community portrait. With that, she turned it over to Stephanie Smith, the pastor and one of the founders of Cathedral in the Night.

CATHEDRAL IN THE NIGHT

They are an outdoor church that, prior to COVID, met in front of First Churches every Sunday night for a brief service that is very welcoming and accepting of everyone and very progressive, Pastor Smith presented. They work with community partners to provide a meal after the service.

The program started 10 years ago. They picked Sunday not because it was a church day but because it was the only day there wasn't a meal in town. They are not a social service agency; their mission is to create a safe space for people to connect on a faith basis and also an opportunity for members to share resources and connect to services. The social service system is very complicated, and their hope is to give hope and to empower people to navigate agencies. She works very hard to know agencies so she can be a bridge builder and help people get the help they need. They also try to fill in gaps in needs if possible while trying to connect people with an organization that can help with bigger issues and underlying problems.

She shared an anecdote about a member of their community who was struggling with addiction and then just sort of disappeared one day. Out of the blue, he sent her a message that he had been in homeless on and off in the area for eight years and had been really struggling. He had spent some time in shelters and

slept outside for four and a half winters. During this time he would always come to their services. He said there were times when he was at the end of his road mentally and physically and coming to their services always changed his outlook and made him feel like he was wanted and cared about. He had several opiate overdoses and one of their Dart officers, Adam, found him and took care of him. He got him to the hospital and spent the whole day with him, helping him to get into a treatment center. He wrote to her and Adam to say thank you for not giving up on him. "That's a lot of what we do," she shared.

Councilor Maire joined at 5:25 p.m.

She expressed appreciation for the support of Councilor Foster and suggested ways others might want to be involved. In non-COVID times, people can come by and hang out and if they ever want to provide food, they would love that as well. They often reach people who aren't being reached by other agencies because the bar [for access] is so low. They're outside so anyone can just walk over.

What eviction numbers don't take into account is people who are not on a lease, who are couch-surfing with other people. What she is seeing a lot of this winter are people living with a family member or friend who have no legal rights to their dwellings. Some are now living in their cars in the winter. "We do not have a warming center right now, and that's a real concern," she said. It's one thing to be outside overnight; it's another thing to be outside 24 hours a day.

There's a lot they do really well in town but she thinks they need to do a better job of engaging community members concerned about the increase in homelessness and talking about how difficult it is for some people to go to a shelter. It really needs to be housing first. To be in a shelter can be really overwhelming, especially with COVID. It's hard to be in a small space with a lot of people who may also be struggling. She hears from a lot of women that it is very uncomfortable to be in a space with men because of past experiences. She would love to see a women's shelter not just focused on domestic violence. There are a lot of barriers that make it really hard for people to be in congregate living.

Councilor LaBarge asked Steph for her contact info, and she shared: pastorstephsmith@gmail.com

Councilors asked questions and offered comments. Councilor LaBarge said she was shocked by the eviction numbers presented.

On the brighter side, President Biden has extended the CDC moratorium on evictions until the end of March, Pamela Schwarz reported. Extension is half the battle; they really need to strengthen the moratorium and make it more comprehensive, she suggested.

CITY ROLE

The city is working hard on getting the resilience hub, which will function as a warming center, Councilor Jarrett observed. He asked if there is any way the city can assist in getting a temporary warming center set up this winter. In general, how can the city assist providers? He asked. They've talked about having a dedicated staff person to coordinate and advance resources and options around housing, he noted.

Potential space for a warming shelter has been offered up but, at this point, there is no one to organize or staff it, Pastor Smith said. She thinks they could find volunteers, but the facility/program needs some direction and oversight from an agency. It is a scary time to ask people to be inside with one another, she

acknowledged. Those are some barriers. They do need someone to oversee it. The United Way had a lot of people volunteer so she doesn't think volunteers would necessarily be an issue.

Re: the general question of how the city can better assist, she honestly thinks the city's on the right path with the resilience center, Pamela Schwarz added. She sees the city as more of a funnel and support than as a staffing entity for this purpose. The key is supporting the infrastructure that already exists and supporting new infrastructure through the resilience hub; in other words, continuing on the path the city is already on by continuing to make the resilience hub the top priority that it is.

There's a need for more social workers as well, Pastor Smith added. Their caseload is way too high. She is not sure that's the city's concern.

LANDLORDS

As a follow-up, Councilor Foster said she knows many small landlords rely on rent money to keep their own homes. She wondered if anything is available during the moratorium to help people facing foreclosure.

One of the reforms to the RAFT program was to create something called the 'landlord door' so landlords could apply directly to RAFT on a tenant's behalf to assist in the back payment of rent to protect their own assets, Ms. Schwarz advised. Earlier, forbearance on loans was provided and there was a lot of advocacy to strengthen and extend that through the Housing Stability Act, but it was not adopted in the last session. There is no explicit foreclosure protection but there is the option of seeking rental assistance on behalf of their tenants, she clarified.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE

Councilor Thorpe asked if the problem is the lack of availability of public counsel for individuals facing eviction.

A legal assistance program was part of the governor's initiative, Ms. Schwarz said. Advocates such as Community Legal Aid are working very hard to create more access to legal assistance during COVID-19. It demonstrates the gaps in tenant protections. People's housing is being threatened, and they are getting a piece of paper. They may or may not know what it means and whether to seek legal assistance. The good news is that the legislature did pass a law requiring certain language to be in the notice to quit that in theory would advise the tenant where to call. Still, there are gaps in the receipt of information, in the ability and capacity to act on it and in the ability to obtain legal representation, she confirmed.

The program is not big enough to cover the level of demand that's out there. Yes, there's an increase in resources, but no, it's not enough. It brings to bear how critical it is to have laws that protect people's housing stability during this period. It is why they need the housing stability act. Once tenants are in the realm of receiving a notice to quit, they are in danger of being evicted.

Support is needed even to complete the CDC form and the RAFT application, Ms. Schwarz acknowledged. Some level of assistance, if not a trained lawyer, is necessary. She got a data point from Way Finders that 50% of the applications have missing data.

Robert Eastman said he hasn't paid rent since June and has not finished filling out his RAFT application. He said he wanted to ask Ms. Schwarz a little more about housing first. He keeps hearing that it's the

solution. He is wondering, practically speaking, what housing first means and what systems are in place for getting people into housing.

HUD, the federal housing partner, has an entire program based on housing first, Ms. Schwarz advised. In their region alone HUD provides several million dollars to address homelessness with the housing first approach. It funds permanent supportive housing units for those most at risk; i.e., people who experience chronic homelessness and have the highest vulnerability. That's one lane of what housing first means. There is a whole system, including a coordinated entry system, a prioritization process and a list.

The real answer to housing first is more affordable housing, she asserted. This calls for a policy shift that is about political will. They can be proud; Northampton is out front compared to other communities and still doesn't have nearly enough affordable housing. They get to wear the badge that they are over and above the 10% level. Still, a soon-to-be-released greater Springfield housing study with Way Finders as the lead sponsor, including Hampshire, Hampden and Franklin counties, will tell them what they instinctively know: only one in four extremely low income people get affordable housing across the country. There is a 75% gap in affordable housing units. The real answer to housing first is more affordable housing, she stressed.

There is a cap on the amount of rent Section 8 will pay in any given city, Heather Craig advised. The cap for Northampton on a two-bedroom apartment is \$1,100 including utilities. She expressed the opinion that it is not a reasonable cap for their housing market.

Eliot CHS Homeless Services

Jay Levy spoke at length about outreach services provided by Eliot CHS Homeless Services (EHS). The Projects Assisting Transitions from Homelessness (PATH) team works closely with shelter providers and the coordinated entry system, doing the vulnerability assessments and getting people on the 'by name' list, he explained.

Overall, 11 workers are in the program. Two workers provide the bulk of service around the Northampton area, Brendon Clant and Sharlyn Arnelle. Both are extremely dedicated individuals who have been doing this work for many, many years. He himself has been doing it since the 1980's.

EHS gets funds through the Department of Mental Health (DMH) and through SAMSA so it is both state and federally funded. The targets are primarily folks with mental health issues but also people with dual-diagnoses and virtually anyone who is unsheltered because there are such high incidences of trauma and mental health issues with that population. PATH is very good because it is also clinical and able to help people qualify for DMH services and housing. Some of that housing, referred to as 'Shelter+Care' Services, is connected with the coordinated entry and 'by name' list. In the last four months, they have gotten DMH eligibility for three individuals, and all three got housed through that program.

They have also connected people from Northampton to permanent supportive housing in Greenfield and Millers Falls. Community Human Development (CHD) runs those permanent supportive housing services with funding from HUD.

It all started with the outreach Sharlyn and Brendon were doing. With COVID-19, there has been a lot of issues with people having no place to go. Not everyone will go to shelters. There are folks with a high level of trauma and easily-triggered flight or fight responses. Over the past three months, they have connected a

number of people directly from the streets of Northampton with a hotel in Holyoke. In addition, they have some transitional hotel money through PATH and have two people connected with hotels that way.

They work as a team with other providers. He mentioned Alan Wolf has sent him some referrals. PATH is more of an outreach service. It provides transitional services around housing placements to help the placement be successful. They remain very active in the case for three to four months. In some cases, they may lengthen that to six months to a year if situations warrant.

Recently they have increased their services to do something called C-spect, which are housing stabilization services. He has added 1.5 full-time equivalents (FTE's) to his staff to do housing stabilization services for chronically homeless folks that are billable to Medicaid. This is a way to get money into their service to hire more people.

In response to a question about how residents can help homeless individuals living in their neighborhoods, Mr. Levy said it is largely a matter of treating them respectfully and sharing information about available resources.

In response to a question from Councilor Jarrett, he explained that the 'by name' list is a list of all the people who are homeless in the area ranked according to vulnerability. Prioritization is based on people who are most vulnerable, at risk of being hospitalized, dying or chronically homeless. They try to house those people first. Part of housing first is getting housing to people who are most vulnerable the quickest. The list tends to be very large. He would imagine it is at least 150 people.

Councilor Jarrett asked about the percentage of people they are actually able to place in housing.

The vast majority of people on the list will not get matched to permanent supportive housing funded by HUD but they still work to connect them to needed services. He mentioned hotel housing as an example. It is really a small percentage that is able to go from the streets to housing. They may end up in shelters and other places in the meantime. In terms of the number connected to HUD resources, it is a very tiny percentage. Less than 10% are being connected to permanent supportive housing.

It has become a supplemental program vs. something that fully funds supportive housing, Jay Sacchetti confirmed.

Councilor Foster asked the typical timeline from outreach and getting to know folks to being able to connect them with services.

Levy said it varies. They think in terms of stages of engagement. It goes from pre-engagement where they try to establish an initial communication that's welcomed to the engagement phase where ongoing contact is welcomed and clients begin to set boundaries to the contracting phase where outreach workers connect to peoples' goals and come to some agreement on what they're going to work on together. With some it can happen in one meeting, while with others it can take several months. The range is anywhere from immediate - meaning they get to the point of contracting and offering some services in the same meeting - to several months or never happening.

Outreach workers also work on things like health insurance, health care and helping people obtain identification, Mr. Levy said. The key to their service is everything they do is voluntary and based on choice.

There may be rare circumstances where if a person is a danger to themselves or others they may look at some involuntary options, but that is very rare.

Councilor LaBarge asked specifically about an individual in her ward who is homeless and living on his property in a truck. The city stepped in several years ago to help him get a place to live in Florence but that did not last. His family has called her looking for help. She asked how she can get help for him.

This is very difficult because she is talking about somebody living on his own land in a vehicle, Mr. Levy said. With regard to individual rights, if he is not deemed a danger to himself or others, they have to uphold personal choice. Then, it is really a matter of who he might engage with. Sometimes a friend or family member might bridge relationships by introducing him to a social worker. But if an outreach worker goes out and he says, "I don't want you to be here right now," he has the right to say that. Because he's on private property, it's going to be respected.

What they're always trying to figure out is what does the person value? What would they find helpful to offer? If they are affiliated in a religious way, maybe introducing them to what Steph does would be a meaningful first step. Sometimes that's a better place to start. He would consider 'thinking out of the box' in terms of ways to engage him. What's exciting about housing first is they're not starting with treatment or impairment, they're saying, 'we want to help you get settled or housed.' They start with housing. He also suggested letting him know about local shelter options in case things get too bad or he gets too cold in his truck.

PUBLIC COMMENT

In terms of housing, Jose Adastra said he thinks it would be great if people would show solidarity with the demands of Northampton Abolition Now (NAN) to use the almost million dollars taken away from the police by the mayor and immediately make a Department of Community Care. There should be someone who can go there who is part of the town's infrastructure. He is here to say housing is not complete without care. You can house someone over and over again and they're not going to stay in that house unless you take care of what traumatized them in the first place. "It shouldn't be our neighbor's burden, there should be a crew in town that takes care of that," he asserted. Some of the people on the street have been on the street since he was eight years old.

SERVICENET

Jay Sacchetti of ServiceNet gave an update on the operation of the emergency shelter at First Churches. He credited the tremendous effort of First Churches and the city for bringing that particular site to fruition. The shelter opened in December and there are probably 25 to 27 people there tonight. ServiceNet also operates the Grove Street shelter, which is full with 15 occupants. The target number for beds is 45 so they are getting close to that. With the cold weather forecast, they expect to be full over the next few nights.

They have worked very closely with Health Director Merridith O'Leary and her department has been absolutely crucial to keeping people healthy and keeping the shelter relatively COVID-free. They have had only one case there since the beginning of December. People who test positive can go to an isolation hotel in Pittsfield with transportation provided by the sheriff. Manna provides lunch and dinner and Friends of the Homeless provides breakfast. Staffing is a struggle. It's a tough time to find employees but they are working through that and keeping the site staffed. They work with EHS. Dr. Bossie provides a standing order for testing with the Cooley Dickinson Hospital, and the health department runs testing and vaccination at the senior center. All the guests of the shelter have been offered a vaccine but some have refused. That to

them is a bit concerning; they wish everybody would get vaccinated. Most of their staff have been vaccinated at this point.

The resource center is open two days a week (Tuesday and Thursday) primarily for health care for the homeless. Dr. Bossie provides medical care. It is open 24/7 for residents to shower and do laundry. (There are no shower facilities at First Churches.) The Mayor's office has been really helpful in getting everything up and running smoothly.

He fielded questions from councilors, encouraging anyone interested in volunteering to contact the United Way.

COMMUNITY ACTION PIONEER VALLEY (CAPV)

Danna Boughton gave an overview of Community Action Pioneer Valley's (CAPV's) programs and services. Its major programs are Head Start and fuel assistance and it also administers the WIC program, some family support programs and a volunteer tax assistance program. She coordinates the Community Resources and Advocacy program, which includes an information and referral service. The majority of calls right now are around housing and eviction needs. They typically are looking at helping people prior to their being evicted. In making referrals, they try to determine the best place for people to get help, whether CAPV or Way Finders.

Way Finders has access to up to \$10,000 per household for people struggling with eviction. For many people, especially those owing \$5,000 to \$8,000, this is the best place to apply. CAPV doesn't have access to funding but can help with the application process. They help people understand the eviction process and calm them down through the process.

She described the RAFT and IRMA programs in greater detail. Way Finders has an online application process with lots of questions. Their agency helps people complete applications. People earning 80% of the area median income (AMI) are eligible to apply; i.e. – income of less than \$47,850 for a single person and \$68,300 for a household of four. Folks with a financial hardship related to COVID qualify for either the RAFT or IRMA program. IRMA is for people earning between 50 and 80% of the AMI. Both programs can help with foreclosure and mortgage payments and also with rent. Funding up to \$10,000 is available.

Community Legal Aid helps people who are already involved in the court process.

CAPV has some funds available through the City of Northampton as well to help people behind on their rent, she shared. She encouraged anyone who knows of someone behind on their rent or mortgage to refer them to CAPV. The phone number is (413) 582-4237. CAPV is also the home of the coordinated entry program. She directed people to www.threecountycoc.communityaction.us for more information.

DISCUSSION

When it comes to services, a recurring theme is that there is a lot going on and a lot of outreach needed but also a lot of gaps in service, Daniel Cannity commented. What are things their organizations would need to scale up services to fill in those gaps? He asked. What is it that the city could provide and what might they need to lobby the state for?

The biggest thing on her mind is there needs to be a warming shelter of some kind and someone to oversee that, Pastor Smith responded. With any of these organizations, it would be nice to be able to pay

people fairer wages for what they're doing. She would like to see people getting paid more for the courageous and difficult work they're doing.

Robert Eastman said that, in addition to a warming center, he has heard from the housing community that mutual aid grants would be helpful. He has heard from people in other communities about unconditional grants that have successfully helped people get into housing earlier. He is curious if that is an option that has been considered.

Councilor Nash said he is not familiar with this.

Pastor Smith expressed the understanding that Robert is referring to a fund people could donate to that others could access directly to meet personal needs rather than receiving funding with a lot of rules. With so much stimulus money going to people who do not need it, she would love people to have an opportunity to donate it to those that do. She mentioned people who might just need a chunk of money for first, last and security to get into housing and might be able to sustain themselves once in housing.

Sadly, they will not be able to solve all these problems tonight, Councilor Nash concluded. A lot of courageous work is going on, but unfortunately, it's not enough. He is completely committed to continuing this ongoing conversation. He gave a shout out to the mayor's office for all the work they've done in quietly coordinating a lot of this and thanked the speakers.

6. New Business

At next month's Community Resources Committee meeting members will be considering zoning language that will make it easier for affordable housing to come to Northampton, Councilor Nash advised.

7. Adjourn. Councilor Foster moved to adjourn the Community Resources Committee meeting. Councilor Thorpe seconded. The motion was approved on a roll call vote of 3 Yes, 0 No with Councilor Jarrett absent.

Councilor Quinlan moved to adjourn City Services. Councilor Foster seconded. The motion carried 4 Yes, 0 No by roll call vote. The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

Prepared By:

Laura Krutzler, Administrative Assistant
(413) 587-1210

**City of Northampton
MASSACHUSETTS**

In the Year Two Thousand Twenty-One

Upon the Recommendation of Mayor David J. Narkewicz and Planning & Sustainability

21.313 An Ordinance to Amend the Zoning Map, §350-3.4, at Chapel Street

An Ordinance of the City of Northampton, Massachusetts, providing that the Code of Ordinances, City of Northampton, Massachusetts, be amended by amending Section 350-3.4, the Zoning Map, to add a new Smart Growth-c overlay district.

Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Northampton, in City Council assembled, as follows:

Amend {§ 350-3.4 Zoning Map to add additional Smart Growth-c overlay district (SG-c), in addition to the existing SG overlays, overlain on the existing Planned Village District (PV), on Map ID 38A-149-001, as shown below. SG-c matches the zoning for affordable housing on Laurel Street and other areas of the former Northampton State Hospital, now known as Village Hill.}

